

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 2, 2009. Claims 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10-13 are now presented for examination. Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 and 12 are the independent claims, and have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. These changes are intended to ensure that the claims conform to current USPTO practice regarding statutory subject matter, and to clarify certain of the claim language. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration.

In the Office Action, Claims 4, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended those claims as deemed necessary to ensure that they are directed to statutory subject matter, and therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

In addition, Claims 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the cited *Moseley* document.

Independent Claim 2 is directed to an information apparatus comprising a control unit. When a notice “scheduled” date arrives while the claimed information apparatus is in a power-OFF status and then the apparatus is powered ON, the control unit provides a notification of any “schedule” as to which a reminder has not yet been given and for which an indicated notice time is not more than a predetermined time in the past before the current date. On the other hand, the control unit does not provide such a reminder as to any “schedules” as to which the indicated notice time is more than the predetermined time in the past before the current date.

Independent Claim 4 is directed to a computer-implemented method of controlling an information apparatus, in which, in a registration step, there are registered a

plurality of “schedules” each having a date set, in accordance with a user’s operation, and in a notification step, when a notice “scheduled” date arrives while the information apparatus is in a power-OFF status and then the power supply is powered ON, there is provided a notification of any “schedule” as to which no reminder has yet been given, and as to which the indicated notice time is not more than a predetermined time before the notice scheduled date, as a reminder. According to Claim 4, when a notice “scheduled” date comes while the apparatus is in the power-OFF status and then the power supply is powered ON, then in the notification step no notification is provided of any “schedule” whose indicated notice time is more than the predetermined time before the notice “scheduled” date.

Moseley relates to a system in which a user can instruct that a reminder be given for a schedule item, and can how long before the schedule-item time (due date) the reminder is displayed. For example, the user may specify four days for that period, and then a reminder will be displayed four days before the due date.

In the aspects of the present invention to which the various independent claims are directed, reminders having older notice dates, set in the past, are not indicated. Further, in the aspect of the invention set forth in Claim 2, a predetermined time in the past is set and is used in determining which old reminders notification is not to be made for, while in that to which Claim 8 is directed, the number of schedules for which notification is to be provided is determined. Applicant submits that nothing has been found in *Moseley* that would teach or suggest any of these three features, and therefore submits that each of the independent claims is allowable over that document.

The other claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above, and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at

least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

/Leonard P Diana/
Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCBS_WS 4668300v1